

TAX POLICIES, VINTAGE CAPITAL, AND EXIT AND ENTRY OF PLANTS

A Dissertation

by

SHAO-JUNG CHANG

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2005

Major Subject: Economics

TAX POLICIES, VINTAGE CAPITAL, AND EXIT AND ENTRY OF PLANTS

A Dissertation

by

SHAO-JUNG CHANG

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Dennis W. Jansen
Committee Members,	Daren B.H. Cline
	Qi Li
	Genevieve Verdier

Head of Department,	Leonardo Auernheimer
---------------------	----------------------

December 2005

Major Subject: Economics

ABSTRACT

Tax Policies, Vintage Capital, and Exit and Entry of Plants. (December 2005)

Shao-jung Chang, B.A., National Cheng Chi University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Dennis W. Jansen

Following Chamley, Lucas, Laitner, and Aiyagari, this dissertation continues to explore the answer for the question of zero capital taxation by discussing how taxes on capital income, labor income, and property affect the economy in the context of a vintage capital model where the embodied technology grows exogenously. The government maximizes social welfare by finding the optimal combinations of the three tax rates in the steady state and examines the welfare gain/loss over and after the transitions caused by different types of shocks. The simulation method used here is linear approximation.

My results show that in the steady-state economy, given a fixed level of government expenditure and a zero property tax rate, the capital-income tax rate that maximizes steady-state utility may be negative, zero, or positive depending on the level of government expenditure. I also find that, for many values of government spending, the highest level of steady-state utility occurs with a subsidy to capital income and a tax on labor income. Finally, I find that when taxes on capital income, labor income, and property are available, capital-income taxes are generally the last resort to finance government expenditures.

My results show that in the transitional economy, when tax rates are permanently changed and the government expenditure is near zero, the loss of utility over the transition from no taxes to capital subsidies is too large so the idea itself is not utility-enhancing. Secondly, I find that when the government expenditure is low and a positive technology shock occurs, social welfare in the economy without capital-

income taxes may perform better in the early phase of the transition but worse in the later phase of the transition than that in the economy without property taxes. However, the situation becomes the opposite as government expenditures increase. In addition, when one tax is allowed to change, a changing labor-income tax may bring more utility over the transition than the other two taxes. Finally, when the government expenditure is unexpectedly reduced, I find that using property taxes rather than capital-income taxes stimulates consumption and employment more given a higher initial level of government expenditure.

To my parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Jansen, and my committee members, Dr. Cline, Dr. Li, and Dr. Verdier for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. Thanks also to my friends and the department faculty and staff for making my time at Texas A&M University a great experience. Finally, thanks to my parents for their encouragement and to my husband for his patience and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Aim of This Dissertation	2
II THE MODEL ECONOMY	6
A. The Story	6
B. The Productivity of a Plant	10
C. Decisions by Production Firms	12
D. Decisions by Investment Firms	15
E. Decisions by Consumers	16
F. Decisions by Government	18
III THE STEADY-STATE ECONOMY	21
A. Approximating Integrals	21
B. Building and Solving a Stationary System	21
C. Parameters	25
D. Optimal Tax Policies in the Transformed Model Economy .	26
IV THE TRANSITIONAL ECONOMY	53
A. Building and Solving a Dynamic System	53
B. Quantitative Experiments	54
1. Impulse Response to a Permanent Change in Tax Rates	55

CHAPTER	Page
2. Impulse Response to a Positive Technology Shock with Fixed Tax Rates	60
3. Impulse Response to a Positive Technology Shock with One Changing Tax Rate	71
4. Impulse Response to a Negative Government Ex- penditure Shock	76
V CONCLUSIONS	84
REFERENCES	86
VITA	89

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		Page
1	The Events in a Period	7
2	The Creation of a New Plant	12
3	Distribution of Plant Productivity in the Steady State	27
4	Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values De- rived When $G^* = 10^{-9}$ and $\tau^p = 0$	31
5	Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values De- rived When $G^* = 0.1$ and $\tau^p = 0$	34
6	Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values De- rived When $G^* = 0.2$ and $\tau^p = 0$	36
7	Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values De- rived When $G^* = 0.3$ and $\tau^p = 0$	38
8	Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values De- rived When $G^* = 0.4$ and $\tau^p = 0$	40
9	Exit Threshold, Exit Rate, and Entry Rate	46
10	Values in the Steady State When $G^* = 10^{-9}$	48
11	Values in the Steady State When $G^* = 0.4$	50
12	Impulse Response When (τ_c, τ_w) Changes From $(0, 0)$ to $(-0.4578,$ $0.2289)$	57
13	Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_p = 0$ ($G^* = 0.1$ –Solid, 0.2 –Dashed & Dotted, 0.3 –Dashed, 0.4 –Dotted)	61
14	Rest of the Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_p = 0$ ($G^* =$ 0.1 –Solid, 0.2 –Dashed & Dotted, 0.3 –Dashed, 0.4 –Dotted)	63

FIGURE		Page
15	Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_c = 0$ ($G^* = 0.1$ —Solid, 0.2—Dashed & Dotted, 0.3—Dashed, 0.4—Dotted)	66
16	Rest of the Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_c = 0$ ($G^* = 0.1$ —Solid, 0.2—Dashed & Dotted, 0.3—Dashed, 0.4—Dotted)	67
17	Impulse Response: $\tau_p = 0$ (Solid) vs. $\tau_c = 0$ (Dashed)	70
18	Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $G^* = 0.1$ (τ_c —Solid, τ_w —Dashed & Dotted, τ_p —Dashed)	72
19	Rest of the Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $G^* = 0.1$ (τ_c —Solid, τ_w —Dashed & Dotted, τ_p —Dashed)	74
20	Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_p = 0$	77
21	Rest of the Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_p = 0$. . .	79
22	Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_c = 0$	81
23	Rest of the Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_c = 0$. . .	82

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Parameter Values	26
2	Values in the Steady State without Government	28
3	Consumption and Utility in the Steady State with Lump-sum Tax . .	29
4	Values in the Steady State with Distortionary Taxes ($\tau_p = 0$)	42
5	Values in the Steady State with Distortionary Taxes ($\tau_c = 0$)	44
6	Values in the Steady State with Distortionary Taxes	52
7	Exit Threshold, Exit Rate, and Entry Rate	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is widely known that taxing capital income is taxing future consumption. Faced with taxes on capital income, consumers will consume more and save less to avoid being taxed on capital income in the future. But why is capital income still taxed?

Chamley (1986) discusses the optimal long-run capital-income tax rate, and argues that in an infinitely-lived representative agent model, even though the current (short-run) capital-income tax rate may be positive (because the current capital stock is fixed), the optimal capital-income tax rate should be zero in the long run. Lucas (1990) and Laitner (1995) advocate this view and show that if the U.S. economy switches from the currently positive capital-income tax rate to a zero capital-income tax rate, and credibly commits to this rate of zero, the U.S. economy will experience a welfare gain. Atkeson, Chari, and Kehoe (1999) show that Chamley's result is well established even when his model is further extended. However, as Aiyagari (1995) points out, the currently positive capital-income tax rate may be optimal. By also using an infinitely-lived representative agent model and adding idiosyncratic shocks to individual income and an uninsured market structure into the model, Aiyagari argues that, faced with a fluctuating income, consumers have the incentive to save more out of precautionary motives and thus overly accumulate capital. When capital is over-accumulated, the return on capital is depressed and falls below the rate of time preference. A positive capital-income tax rate can discourage consumers' willingness to save and adjust capital income so that the return on capital is equal

This dissertation follows the style of *American Economic Review*.

to the rate of time preference.

A. The Aim of This Dissertation

This dissertation attempts to find out how capital-income tax rates affect welfare in the long run in a vintage capital model where embodied technology progresses exogenously and plants are retired if their current value becomes lower than their scrap value. To be more precise, we want to know if the optimal capital-income tax rate is zero or positive in a vintage capital model with the exit and entry of plants.

There are two elements that make this paper different from Chamley (1986) and Aiyagari (1995): Vintage capital and the exit and entry of plants. The concept of vintage capital is that technology is embodied within capital (either equipment or machine) when capital is created, and the productivity of that capital cannot be changed after it is made. When the productivity of the capital becomes too low, firms invest in new capital. In Greenwood, Hercowitz, Krusell (1997), the authors discuss if the idea of vintage capital is practical. They show that prices of equipment have been declining over the post-war years, and they conclude that the technology of producing equipment is making equipment either more productive or cheaper over time. They conclude that the idea of vintage capital is able to explain this phenomenon.¹ Literature on vintage capital and investment behavior has been growing since then.² For example, Cooley, Greenwood, and Yorukoglu (1997) endogenize the rate of embodied technology growth by building a two-sector model with human capital accumulation and discuss how tax policies affect the compositions of the ag-

¹For earlier literature on equipment or capital price and economic growth, please see DeLong and Summers (1991) and Jones (1994).

²Literature on examining the assumption of vintage capital by using empirical data at the industry level has also been growing recently such as Cummins and Violante (2002), and Sakellaris and Wilson (2004).

gregate capital stock. Yorukoglu (1998) argues why investment is lumpy when firms can choose to replace or upgrade the current capital stock.³ On the other hand, Hopenhayn (1992) extends a stochastic model for a competitive industry to account for exit, entry, sizes, and growth of plants. Campbell (1998) sets up a model to simulate the correlations among exit and entry rates of plants and output over the business cycle when an exogenous technology shock hits an economy. Cooley and Quadrini (2001) further discusses the relation between firm dynamics and financial markets.

This paper is based on the model of Campbell (1998), who observes the correlations among exit and entry rates of U.S. manufacturing plants and their output growth rates over the business cycle. He notes that the entry rate covaries positively with the contemporaneous output growth rate, and the exit rate leads both the entry rate and the output growth rate. To explain this pattern, his model is based on the phenomenon of exit and entry of plants and the premise of embodied technology growth. Business cycles occur when the embodied technology grows more or less than expected. While a positive shock to embodied technology growth speeds up the exit of marginal plants, more new plants are created and are embodied with higher technology. After some time, when these new plants enter the economy, output grows faster than the trend rate.

This paper departs from Campbell (1998) to discuss how tax policies affect the economy in a vintage capital model and with exit and entry of plants. We introduce a government that engages in government expenditure and pays for this by taxing capital income, labor income, and/or property. The design of the exit and entry of

³Lumpy investment has been further related to the real-business-cycle theory recently. For this part of literature, please see Cooper, Haltiwanger, and Power (1999), Gilchrist and Williams (2000), and Thomas (2002).

plants makes it possible to discuss the effect of a property tax. In our model the plant value can be taxed when ownership of the plant is traded between consumers and firms. When plant value is taxed, it becomes lower and marginal plants whose value is now lower than the scrap value exit the industry. Cooley, Greenwood, and Yorukoglu (1997) also discuss tax policies, but their main focus is on the effects of a capital-income tax and an investment credit on the compositions of the capital stock and welfare in the economy. In our model, government expenditure is assumed to be fixed in the steady state, and tax rates are chosen to satisfy the government budget constraint. There is no debt issued. The government attempts to maximize social welfare by finding optimal combinations of the three tax rates.

Our results show that in a stationary economy, given a fixed level of government expenditure and a zero property tax rate, the optimal capital-income tax rate may be negative, zero, or positive dependent on the level of government expenditure. We find that for many values of government spending the highest level of steady-state utility occurs with a subsidy to capital income and a tax on labor income. Finally, we find that when taxes on capital income, labor income, and property are available, a positive capital-income tax is generally the last resort to finance government expenditures. As for the transitional economy, we find that although subsidizing capital by taxing labor brings more utility in the steady state when government expenditure is small, the idea of moving from the current tax rates to the optimal tax rates is impractical. In addition, we find that when a technology shock hits the economy, letting labor-income tax rate fluctuate may bring higher utility over the transition. Finally, we find that when government expenditure is higher, using property tax rate rather than capital-income tax rate stimulates consumption and employment more when there is an unexpected reduction in the government expenditure.

One contribution of this dissertation is to further expand our knowledge about the optimal capital-income tax. Chamley (1986) tells us that in the long run, the capital income tax rate should be zero. From Aiyagari (1995), we know that with idiosyncratic shocks to income and a market structure of incomplete insurance, the capital-income tax rate may be positive because positive capital-income tax rates can prevent consumers from overly accumulating capital for precautionary motives. We use a vintage capital model of the exit and entry of plants to calculate the optimal capital-income tax rate and find that this rate is not generally zero. In addition, this paper also contributes to the knowledge of the optimal way to finance government expenditures by using capital-income, labor-income, and property taxes.

This dissertation is organized as follows: Chapter II describes the model economy; Chapter III discusses the optimal tax policies in the steady state by examining our simulation results; Chapter IV focuses on the transitions caused by several types of shocks with the presence of government expenditure and tax rates; Chapter V concludes.

CHAPTER II

THE MODEL ECONOMY

A. The Story

In Campbell's (1997) model, the private sector consists of consumers, firms, and plants. Consumers, whose size will later be normalized to one, are identical in ability and preference and are each endowed with same amount of initial wealth and one unit of time per period. In each period, consumers maximize utility by allocating their time between work and leisure and their wealth plus income between consumption and investment in the ownership of plants.

The ownership of plants are traded between consumers and firms. Ownership is purchased by consumers from firms at the end of the period, and is sold back to firms at the beginning of the next period. In other words, plants are held by consumers between periods, and by firms over periods. Plants are either operating plants or developing plants. Operating plants are capable of production, while developing plants are in need of more development (i.e. investment spending) before starting to produce. There are also two types of firms. At the beginning of the period, production firms purchase operating plants and manage them to produce the final good, while investment firms purchase developing plants and further develop them. In addition, production firms scrap unproductive plants after the production period, while investment firms create new plants. At the end of the period, all existing plants are sold to consumers. The timing of these events within a period is shown in Figure 1.

Operating plants differ in productivity. The initial productivity of an operating plant is partly decided by new capital created when the plant is built and is partly




FIGURE 1. The Events in a Period

decided by the degree of success in using the capital with labor to produce the final good a few periods later when the development process is over.¹ The final good produced by an operating plant can then be used as consumption good or new capital. The idea of vintage capital in this model allows for new capital created in each period to be endowed with the most advanced technology available in that period. This frontier technology is assumed to grow exogenously. Capital, once equipped inside a plant, cannot be replaced or upgraded until the plant is scrapped,

¹In this chapter, the length of this whole development process is assumed for illustrative purpose to take two periods and to be fixed across all new plants and over time. In our quantitative experiment in the following chapter, the development process takes five periods to complete, where one period can be thought of as one quarter.

so only new plants are equipped with new capital which in turn is embodied with the leading-edge technology.² The subsequent evolution of productivity at an operating plant depends on the idiosyncratic productivity shock which hits the plant between periods, when consumers own the plant.³ This shock is specific to individual plants, in contrast to the embodied technology shock, which is specific to the whole economy and incorporated into all capital of a particular vintage. The average next-period productivity of an operating plant is expected to be as good as its current-period productivity, so the idiosyncratic productivity shock has mean zero.

In comparison with those in traditional models who earn capital income by renting their own capital to firms, consumers in this model earn capital income by selling their own operating plants to production firms.⁴ What production firms earn from an operating plant is capital income from current production after paying labor and then the scrap value from plants to be retired and the resale value from the rest of the plants. Scrap value is measured in units of the final good, and in this model the units of final good per unit of capital in scrapped plants is assumed to be fixed. Because we assume free entry of firms, production firms compete with each other to the extent that each firm earns zero profit. This implies that the sum of all earnings from an operating plant at the end of the period should equal the purchase cost of the operating plant, the price that production firms pay to consumers for the right to operate the operating plant at the beginning of the period. In Campbell (1998), trade in the ownership of plants is the mechanism for explicitly estimating the exit

²Yorukoglu (1998) assumes that a plant can either replace the whole capital stock or upgrade part of it. How this assumption has an impact on the investment behavior of a plant over the plant's fixed lifetime is the focus in his paper.

³These shocks can be thought of as partly due to a random idiosyncratic depreciation.

⁴Consumers earn no capital income from a developing plant whose productivity remains undetermined until the plant enters the industry.

and entry of plants. This mechanism may look odd at first, but as a matter of fact, consumers in this model, just like those in traditional models, earn capital income in each period. Here that income is realized in the price paid and price received on the trade in operating plants. Note that investment firms also earn zero profit from developing plants, again because of free entry.

After adding the government sector to the original model, our focus is changed to study the effect of fiscal policy within this vintage-capital model with exit and entry of plants.⁵ In this model the government is assumed to finance government expenditure by taxing capital income, labor income, and property. The last tax is collected through a tax on trading the ownership of operating plants. Since operating plants are traded twice between consumers and firms per period, it is assumed that the property tax is imposed on the production firms at the beginning of the period. The interesting part of the property tax lies on its influence on plant value, which was originally decided by the productivity of a plant, and on the exit threshold of productivity, which determines whether a plant survives through next period. Initially we conjecture that there might be a trade-off between the capital-income tax and the property tax for two reasons. First, compared to the tax base for the capital-income tax, the tax base for a property tax is large so that the property tax rate can be set at a relatively low rate compared to the capital-income tax rate. Second, a property tax may influence social welfare because it affects the exit threshold of productivity while capital-income tax does not. We assume the government budget constraint is balanced in each period, and there is no other instrument to pay for government expenditures. Our objective is to explore how

⁵Cooley, Greenwood, and Yorukoglu (1997) discuss a vintage-capital model in which capital has a fixed lifetime and firms decide the optimal time to retire a plant before the capital equipped inside of it reaches its end of lifetime.

capital-income, labor-income, and property taxes interact to decide the economy's long-run equilibrium. In the long run, the capital-augmenting economy grows at a fixed rate, and government expenditure is assumed to grow at the same rate as output. Therefore, after a growing economy is transformed to a stationary economy, government expenditure is again fixed at some level.

B. The Productivity of a Plant

This section explains the decision of the initial productivity of a plant and the evolution of its subsequent productivity until the plant is scrapped. The production of the final good needs capital and labor. An operating plant i faces a Cobb-Douglas production function with elements of effective capital and labor. Effective capital is the "real" unit of capital after its embodied technology is taken into account. At period t , the production function for the plant i is:

$$y_{i,t} = (k_{i,t} e^{v_{i,t}})^{1-\alpha} n_{i,t}^\alpha \quad (2.1)$$

The capital stock of the plant, $k_{i,t}$, is fixed over the plant's lifetime, and its size is normalized to one because the plant's size is irrelevant. There is no limit on a plant's lifetime as long as it survives. The productivity of the plant is given by $e^{v_{i,t}}$, where e is the exponential function and $v_{i,t}$ is a random variable indicating the plant i 's productivity at period t . The labor employed by the plant is $n_{i,t}$, and its output is $y_{i,t}$. The share of labor income is α and is the same across plants and over time. Effective capital is calculated as the product of the plant's capital, $k_{i,t}$, and the plant's productivity, $e^{v_{i,t}}$. Suppose that the productivity of the plant i at period t is $e^{v_{i,t}}$. Its productivity at period $t + 1$ is described by Equation 2.2. Note that $v_{i,t}$ follows a random walk process. The innovation, $\varepsilon_{i,t+1}$, is one of the two idiosyncratic

shocks in this model. It symbolizes the fluctuation of a plant's productivity. This shock is realized between periods, when consumers hold the ownership of plants.

$$v_{i,t+1} = v_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t+1} \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{i,t+1} \sim N(0, \sigma^2) \quad (2.3)$$

To decide the initial productivity of a plant, we first denote the leading-edge technology as z and assume that this technology accumulates according to the following equation:

$$z_t = \mu + z_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t^z \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_t^z \sim N(0, \sigma_z^2) \quad (2.5)$$

Intuitively, the drift, μ , should be positive. The shock to the leading-edge technology is ε_t^z . There are two factors deciding the initial productivity of a plant. One is the leading-edge technology, and the other one is the degree of success in operating the leading-edge technology, which is the second type of idiosyncratic shocks. For a plant being created at period t and entering the industry at period $t + 2$, its initial productivity is a random draw from the following normal distribution with mean z_t (the leading-edge technology at t) and standard deviation σ_e .

$$v_{i,t+2} \sim N(z_t, \sigma_e^2) \quad (2.6)$$

All types of shocks, including the aggregate embodied technology shock and the two idiosyncratic shocks, are revealed between periods. Note that when the

ownership of plants is traded at the beginning of the period, their new productivity is observable to both consumers and firms, while at the end of the period, it is not observable so that the resale price of plants is based on the expectation of the plant's productivity in the next period. Figure 2 illustrates the creation of a new plant before it enters the industry.




FIGURE 2. The Creation of a New Plant

C. Decisions by Production Firms

Production firms have several decisions to make in each period. The first one is to decide the number of operating plants of different levels of productivity to purchase at the beginning of the period. Once this decision is made, these firms hire and allocate labor at the purchased plants, and after the production, they decide if any of the purchased plants should be retired and sell the rest back to consumers. A production firm's profit-maximizing objective function at period t is shown as

follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{k_t(v_t), n_t(v_t), s_t(v_t)} \quad & -(1 + \tau_t^p) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^0(v_t) k_t(v_t) dv_t \\
& + (1 - \tau_t^c) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k_t(v_t) [e^{v_t(1-\alpha)} n_t(v_t)^\alpha - w_t n_t(v_t)] dv_t \\
& + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta s_t(v_t) k_t(v_t) dv_t \\
& + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^1(v_t) [1 - s_t(v_t)] k_t(v_t) dv_t
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

The first term is the total cost of purchasing operating plants of different productivity v_t that is paid to consumers at the beginning of period t . The value of a plant with a certain v_t at the beginning of period t is $q_t^0(v_t)$, and $k_t(v_t)$ is the number of such plants owned by the firm. The property tax that the firm pays for a plant is proportional to the plant's value and is τ_t^p . The second term is the net capital income that the firm earns after paying labor income, $w_t n_t(v_t)$. The real wage is w_t , and $n(v_t)$ is the labor allocated at the plant with v_t . The output of the plant with v_t is $e^{v_t(1-\alpha)} n_t(v_t)^\alpha$, where the plant's capital stock is normalized to one. The tax rate on capital income is τ_t^c . The third term is the scrap value earned from scrapped plants. The scrap value is assumed to be η per unit of capital and to be less than one. The proportion $s(v_t)$ means the percentage of plants with v_t to be scrapped after current production. The last term is the resale value earned from the existing plants. The value of the plant with v_t at the end of the period is $q_t^1(v_t)$. Note that except the first term, the other terms are income earned after production.

A production firm solves its problem in two steps. First, taking the labor hired by the firm, n_t , as fixed, the firm decides how to allocate its labor into their purchased plants of different productivity. The firm's problem is as follows:

$$\max_{n_t(v_t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k_t(v_t) [e^{v_t(1-\alpha)} n_t(v_t)^\alpha] dv_t \quad (2.8)$$

subject to

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k_t(v_t) n_t(v_t) dv_t \leq n_t \quad (2.9)$$

As shown in Solow (1960), after the firm's effective capital is defined as $\bar{k}_t = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k_t(v_t) e^{v_t} dv_t$, a solution for $n_t(v_t)$ can be easily achieved as follows:

$$n_t(v_t) = \frac{n_t e^{v_t}}{\bar{k}_t} \quad (2.10)$$

The solution for $n_t(v_t)$, which decides the amount of labor hired at a plant with a certain v_t , depends on two factors, the labor-effective capital ratio and the plant's productivity. Because production firms are identical, each firm's labor-effective capital ratio is the same as that for the economy.

At the second step, after $n_t(v_t)$ is replaced with Equation 2.10, the firm's aggregate output can be simplified as the Cobb-Douglas production function, and its objective function becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{k_t(v_t), n_t, s_t(v_t)} & -(1 + \tau_t^p) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^0(v_t) k_t(v_t) dv_t + (1 - \tau_t^c) [\bar{k}_t^{1-\alpha} n_t^\alpha - w_t n_t] \\ & + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta s_t(v_t) k_t(v_t) dv_t + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^1(v_t) [1 - s_t(v_t)] k_t(v_t) dv_t \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Next, the firm derives its first-order conditions with respect to $k_t(v_t)$, n_t , and the proportion of plants with productivity v_t to be scrapped, $s_t(v_t)$.

$$w_t = \alpha \left[\frac{\bar{k}_t}{n_t} \right]^{1-\alpha} \quad (2.12)$$

$$q_t^1(\underline{v}_t) = \eta \quad (2.13)$$

$$(1 + \tau_t^p) q_t^0(v_t) = (1 - \tau_t^c) (1 - \alpha) e^{v_t} \left(\frac{\bar{k}_t}{n_t} \right)^{-\alpha} + 1 \{ v_t < \underline{v}_t \} \eta + 1 \{ v_t \geq \underline{v}_t \} q_t^1(v_t) \quad (2.14)$$

The first equation decides the labor hired by the firm. The second equation sets the exit threshold of productivity, \underline{v}_t , such that plants of this specific productivity are indifferent between operation and shutdown after the production. The plant value, which equals the expected sum of a stream of revenue earned from output net of wages paid to labor, rises with the plant's productivity, so a plant with productivity higher than \underline{v}_t survives through the next period and exits otherwise. The third equation implies that the optimal purchase of a plant with productivity v_t yields zero profit. The term on the LHS is the purchase cost of the plant with v_t , and the three terms on the RHS are the after-tax capital income, the scrap value if the plant is scrapped, and the resale value if the plant is sold back to consumers, respectively. $1 \{ \cdot \}$ is an indicator function, which takes the value of 1 when the plant with v_t survives and 0 otherwise.

D. Decisions by Investment Firms

Investment firms make two decisions each period. The first one is to decide the number of developing plants to purchase at the beginning of the period. Investment firms purchase developing plants and further develop them. Meanwhile, these firms

build new plants. At the end of the period, investment firms sell their plants to consumers. An investment firm's objective function at period t is presented as (2.15):

$$\max_{x_t(0), x_t(1)} [q_t^{1i}(1) - q_t^{0i}(0)] x_t(0) + [q_t^{1i}(2) - q_t^{0i}(1)] x_t(1) \quad (2.15)$$

The number of plants, $x_t(0)$, is created at period t , and $x_t(1)$ is the number of plants created at period $t - 1$. The first term is the profits earned from creating new plants. The second term is the profits earned from further developing plants created in the last period. The resale value of a plant developed for j periods is $q_t^{1i}(j)$. The cost of creating a new plant is $q_t^{0i}(0)$, and equals one because the capital stock of a plant is normalized to one and the transformation from consumption good to capital is one-to-one. The purchase cost of a plant created in the last period is $q_t^{0i}(1)$. The zero-profit condition implies the following conditions:

$$q_t^{1i}(1) = q_t^{0i}(0) = 1 \quad (2.16)$$

$$q_t^{1i}(2) = q_t^{0i}(1) \quad (2.17)$$

E. Decisions by Consumers

Consumers are identical in preference. They consume the final good and invest in the portfolio consisting of the ownership of plants with different productivity. They are each endowed with one unit of time to allocate between leisure and work. Utility comes from consumption and leisure. The problem for a consumer j at period s is shown as follows:

$$\max_{c_t^j, n_t^j, i_t^{1j}, i_t^{2j}, k_t^j(v_t)} E_s \left(\sum_{t=s}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t^j, 1 - n_t^j) \right) \quad (2.18)$$

where

$$u(c_t^j, 1 - n_t^j) = \ln c_t^j + \kappa (1 - n_t^j) \quad (2.19)$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} c_t^j + q_t^{1i}(1) i_t^{1j} + q_t^{1i}(2) i_t^{2j} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^1(v_t) k_t^{1j}(v_t) dv_t = \\ (1 - \tau_t^w) w_t n_t^j + q_t^{0i}(1) i_{t-1}^{1j} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^0(v_t) k_t^{0j}(v_t) dv_t \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

$$k_{t+1}^{0j}(v_{t+1}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{v_{t+1} - v_t}{\sigma}\right) k_t^{1j}(v_t) dv_t + \frac{1}{\sigma_e} \phi\left(\frac{v_{t+1} - z_{t-1}}{\sigma_e}\right) i_t^{2j} \quad (2.21)$$

β is the discount factor. There are two constraints. The first one is the budget constraint. At the beginning of period t , the consumer sells his/her plants including operating plants and developing plants created in the last period, i_{t-1}^{1j} , to firms. The number of plants with a certain productivity v_t owned by the consumer j is denoted as $k^{0j}(v_t)$. At the end of period t , the consumer earns labor income, $w_t n_t^j$, and invests in new plants that are created in the current period, i_t^{1j} , the developing plants that are created in the last period and are going to enter the market in the next period, i_t^{2j} , and the surviving operating plants of different productivity, $k^{1j}(v_t)$. The second constraint shows the evolution of the next-period productivity of the plants invested by the consumer. The first term on the RHS is the expected number of the purchased operating plants having a certain productivity in the next period, where σ is the standard deviation of v and $\frac{1}{\sigma}\phi(\cdot)$ is the normalized standard deviation of v . The second term on the RHS is the number of plants that are ready to enter

the market and will have the same productivity in the next period, where σ_e is the standard deviation of z and $\frac{1}{\sigma_e}\phi(\cdot)$ is the normalized standard deviation of z . The first-order conditions for the consumer j are:

$$q_t^1(v_t) = E_t \left[\beta \frac{c_t^j}{c_{t+1}^j} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{v_{t+1} - v_t}{\sigma}\right) q_{t+1}^0(v_{t+1}) dv_{t+1} \right] \quad (2.22)$$

$$q_t^{1i}(2) = E_t \left[\beta \frac{c_t^j}{c_{t+1}^j} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_e} \phi\left(\frac{v_{t+1} - z_{t-1}}{\sigma_e}\right) q_{t+1}^0(v_{t+1}) dv_{t+1} \right] \quad (2.23)$$

$$q_t^{1i}(1) = E_t \left[\beta \frac{c_t^j}{c_{t+1}^j} q_{t+1}^{0i}(1) \right] \quad (2.24)$$

$$\kappa = (1 - \tau_t^w) \frac{w_t}{c_t^j} \quad (2.25)$$

The first equation decides $k^{1j}(v_t)$, the number of surviving operating plants with productivity v_t . The second equation decides i_t^{2j} , the number of plants created in the last period and starting to produce in the next period. The third equation decides i_t^{1j} , the number of plants created in the current period. The fourth equation decides the labor supply. The labor-income tax rate is τ_t^w .

F. Decisions by Government

The government taxes capital income, labor income, and property to finance government expenditure. Government expenditure does not enter the utility function.⁶ There is no borrowing or transfer payment from the government to consumers.

⁶Since our interest is in the preferred combination of taxes, and since we are going to hold the level of government expenditures fixed in the transformed and stationary economy, this assumption is not important to our results.

In equilibrium, government expenditure grows as fast as output so that it remains a constant proportion of economy-wide output. The government budget constraint is shown in Equation 2.26.

$$G_t = \tau_t^w w_t N_t + \tau_t^c (\bar{K}_t^{1-\alpha} N_t^\alpha - w_t N_t) + \tau_t^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^0(v_t) K_t(v_t) dv_t \quad (2.26)$$

where

$$Y_t = \bar{K}_t^{1-\alpha} N_t^\alpha \quad (2.27)$$

Denote government expenditure as G . The N , \bar{K} , $K(v)$, and Y are labor, effective capital, number of plants with productivity v , and output at the aggregate level, respectively. The government investigates the effect of various combinations of taxes on capital income, labor income, and property on the economy's long-run equilibrium given a fixed path of government expenditure.

This economic system includes the first-order conditions of production firms (Equations 2.12, 2.13, 2.14), investment firms (Equations 2.16, 2.17), and consumers (Equations 2.22, 2.23, 2.24, 2.25). In addition, there are two constraints of consumers (Equations 2.20, 2.21), one definition of the effective capital, one government budget constraint (Equation 2.26), and two aggregate resource constraints (Equations 2.28, 2.29) as follows:

$$C_t + I_t^1 + G_t = Y_t + \eta \int_{-\infty}^{v_t} K_t(v_t) dv_t \quad (2.28)$$

$$I_{t+1}^2 = I_t^1 \quad (2.29)$$

Aggregate consumption is C and aggregate investment in the creation of new

plants is I^1 . The second term on the RHS of the first equation is the units of the final good that is transformed from scrapped capital. Note that investment defined in the traditional way is either $Y_t - C_t - G_t$ or, equivalently, $I_t^1 - \eta \int_{-\infty}^{v_t} K_t(v_t) dv_t$. The second constraint ensures that all new plants enter the industry after the development process is completed. All markets are cleared. In the next chapter, we examine our simulation results and discuss how tax policies affect the economy's long-run equilibrium.

CHAPTER III

THE STEADY-STATE ECONOMY

A. Approximating Integrals

To compute the steady-state values, we need to approximate the integrals appearing in various equations. These integrals mainly come from the distribution of the number of plants with different productivity and the corresponding distribution of the plant value. The method we use is the Gaussian quadrature approximation, which was also used in Campbell (1997). To illustrate the idea of Gaussian quadrature approximation, suppose there is a function as follows:

$$g(y) = b(y) + \int_a^b A(y, x)g(x)dx \quad (3.1)$$

As there is no analytic expression for the integral on the right side of the equation, this method approximates the integral with a weighted sum as follows:

$$g(y) \approx b(y) + \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i(a, b)A(y, x_i)g(x_i) \quad (3.2)$$

The abscissas x_i 's and weights ω_i 's are decided by the Gauss-Legendre N-point quadrature formula. Each abscissa, x_i , is located between a and b and is assigned its weight, ω_i . There are N chosen abscissas, (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) to replace y in the equation. With a system of N equations consisting of $g(x_1), g(x_2), \dots, g(x_N)$, the distribution of $g(y)$ can be approximated through simple matrix operations.

B. Building and Solving a Stationary System

Because the embodied technology grows constantly over time, such a non-stationary economy needs a transformation to stationarity before steady-state values

can be derived. The original economy is transformed in two steps. The first step is to transform the economy into a labor-augmenting economy by defining:

$$u_t = v_t - z_{t-1} \quad (3.3)$$

$$\underline{u}_t = \underline{v}_t - z_{t-1} \quad (3.4)$$

$$K_t^T(u_t) = K_t(u_t + z_{t-1}) \quad (3.5)$$

u_t is defined as the difference between a plant's productivity at period t and the leading-edge technology at period $t - 1$, and \underline{u}_t is defined as the difference between the exit threshold of productivity at period t and the leading-edge technology at period $t - 1$. The second step is to transform the labor-augmenting economy into a stationary economy by defining:

$$C_t^* = (e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} z_{t-1}}) C_t \quad (3.6)$$

$$I_t^{*j} = (e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} z_{t-1}}) I_t^j \quad \forall j = 1, 2 \quad (3.7)$$

$$K_t^*(u_t) = (e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} z_{t-1}}) K_t^T(u_t) \quad (3.8)$$

$$\bar{K}_t^* = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{u_t} K_t^*(u_t) du_t \quad (3.9)$$

$$G_t^* = (e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} z_{t-1}}) G_t \quad (3.10)$$

After the second transformation, the new variables are consumption, C_t^* , investment on plants undergoing different periods of development process, I_t^{*j} , distribution of number of plants with different productivity, $K_t^*(u_t)$, effective capital, \bar{K}_t^* , and government expenditure, G_t^* . All are stable in the steady state. The transformed equations are listed below, followed by the explanation of the solution method for deriving steady-state values.

Equations are divided into two groups in order to solve the system. The first group includes the following equations:

If $u_t \leq \underline{u}_t$, then

$$(1 + \tau_t^p) Q_t(u_t) = (1 - \tau_t^c) D_t e^{u_t} + \eta \quad (3.11)$$

If $u_t > \underline{u}_t$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + \tau_t^p) Q_t(u_t) \\ &= (1 - \tau_t^c) D_t e^{u_t} \\ &+ E_t \left\{ \beta \frac{M_{t+1}}{M_t} e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} (\mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{u_{t+1} - u_t + \mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z}{\sigma}\right) Q_{t+1}(u_{t+1}) du_{t+1} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

$$M_t = E_t \left\{ \beta M_{t+1} Q_{t+1}^{0i}(1) e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} (\mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z)} \right\} \quad (3.13)$$

where

$$Q_t^{0i}(1) = Q_t^{1i}(2) \quad (3.14)$$

$$M_t Q_t^{1i}(2) = E_t \left\{ \beta M_{t+1} e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} (\mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_e} \phi\left(\frac{u_{t+1} + z_t - z_{t-1}}{\sigma_e}\right) Q_{t+1}(u_{t+1}) du_{t+1} \right\} \quad (3.15)$$

$$\eta = E_t \left\{ \beta \frac{M_{t+1}}{M_t} e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} (\mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{u_{t+1} - u_t + \mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z}{\sigma}\right) Q_{t+1}(u_{t+1}) du_{t+1} \right\} \quad (3.16)$$

Before computation starts, the technology shock, ε_t^z , and the inverse of con-

sumption, M_t , can be omitted from these equations because there is no technology shock in the steady state, and the steady-state consumption is constant. Given tax rates on capital income and property, there are two unknown variables, D_t and \underline{u}_t , and one unknown distribution of plant value, $Q_t(u_t)$, in this group. To determine \underline{u}_t , a number is chosen for D_t to derive the corresponding distribution of $Q_t(u_t)$, and the chosen D_t is the correct number if it satisfies the Equation 3.16. The second group includes the rest of the equations:

$$D_t = (1 - \alpha) \left(\frac{\bar{K}_t^*}{N_t} \right)^{-\alpha} \quad (3.17)$$

$$M_t (1 - \tau^w) \alpha \left(\frac{\bar{K}_t^*}{N_t} \right)^{1-\alpha} = \kappa \quad (3.18)$$

$$\frac{\bar{K}_t^*}{N_t} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{K_t^*(u_t)}{N_t} e^{u_t} du_t \quad (3.19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K_{t+1}^*(u_{t+1})}{N_t} &= e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} (\mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z)} \\ \{ \int_{\underline{u}_t}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{u_{t+1} - u_t + \mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z}{\sigma}\right) \frac{K_t^*(u_t)}{N_t} du_t &+ \frac{1}{\sigma_e} \phi\left(\frac{u_{t+1} + \mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z}{\sigma_e}\right) \frac{I_t^{*2}}{N_t} \} \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

$$e^{-\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} (\mu_z + \varepsilon_t^z)} \frac{I_{t+1}^{*2}}{N_t} = \frac{I_t^{*1}}{N_t} \quad (3.21)$$

$$\frac{G_t^*}{N_t} = (\tau_t^w \alpha + \tau_t^c (1 - \alpha)) \left(\frac{\bar{K}_t^*}{N_t} \right)^{1-\alpha} + \tau^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} Q_t(u_t) \frac{K_t^*(u_t)}{N_t} du_t \quad (3.22)$$

$$\frac{C_t^* + I_t^{*1} + G_t^*}{N_t} = \left(\frac{\bar{K}_t^*}{N_t} \right)^{1-\alpha} + \eta \int_{-\infty}^{\underline{u}_t} \frac{K_t^*(u_t)}{N_t} du_t \quad (3.23)$$

Since D_t is known now, $\frac{\bar{K}_t^*(u_t)}{N_t}$, $\frac{K_t^*(u_t)}{N_t}$, $\frac{I_t^{*2}}{N_t}$, and $\frac{I_t^{*1}}{N_t}$ can be derived. There are three unknown variables left, and they are τ_t^w , M_t , and $\frac{G_t^*}{N_t}$. Given government expenditure, the correct τ_t^w is the value that satisfies Equations 3.22 and 3.23.

C. Parameters

Given government expenditure and tax rates on capital income, labor income, and property, there are some parameters left to be defined. These parameters include the labor-income share, α , the subjective discount factor, β , the scrap value, η , the average growth rate of embodied technology, μ , the standard deviation of the shock to the productivity of an incumbent plant, σ , the standard deviation of the shock to the initial productivity of a new plant, σ_e , the standard deviation of the shock to embodied technology growth rate, σ_z , and the marginal utility of leisure, κ .

Table 1 lists the values for these parameters as used in Campbell (1998). Labor-income share is 0.66, which equals the labor's average share in the U.S. economy. Given the value of α , μ_z is chosen to match the model's steady-state growth rate of output, $(1 - \alpha)\mu/\alpha$, which is 0.34% per quarter estimated between 1972 and 1988. The annual risk-free interest rate equals the steady state growth path, $\beta^{-1}e^{(1-\alpha)\mu/\alpha}$, and is estimated as 4.4% so β equals 0.9926. σ are chosen as 0.03 out of a range of values from 0 to 0.06. σ_e is chosen to be larger than σ so that young plants faces more productivity uncertainty than old plants. Along with the scrap value η , σ_e is set to match exit rates from the U.S. economies. Finally, σ_z is set so that the standard deviation of the exit rate in the model equals 0.0026, which is derived from the data. Note that because the labor, N , is estimated as 0.26 from the real data, the marginal utility of leisure, κ , can be derived with other steady-state values under no-government scheme. Following that, we perform our experiment on the effects

of various combinations of tax rates on the economy by fixing this derived κ and treating N as a variable.

TABLE 1— Parameter Values

α	β	η	μ	σ	σ_e	σ_z
0.66	0.9926	0.835	0.0066	0.03	0.36	0.0059

D. Optimal Tax Policies in the Transformed Model Economy

The goal of this section is to derive some interesting observations on social welfare in the steady state from the simulation results of the quantitative experiment. This experiment will proceed in three steps, involving various combinations of capital-income, labor-income, and property tax rates. The first step, by assuming zero property tax rate, the government looks for the optimal combination of capital-income and labor-income tax rates that maximizes consumers' utility, taking government expenditure as fixed. This part of the experiment will provide information on the optimal tax rate on capital for this model. Next, we are curious to know if using a property tax instead of a capital-income tax is preferable for the economy. Following that, we allow all three types of tax rates to change in order to examine the combination that yields maximum utility for consumers.

As a basis for comparison, we derive the steady-state values for our economy without government. This provides a baseline economy in which the resource allocation is not distorted by any policy instrument. Provided the above parameters, the distribution of plant productivity in the steady state is illustrated in Figure 3, where the x-axis is labeled as percentage difference between plant productivity and productivity brought by the leading-edge technology and the y-axis is labeled as

units of plants of different levels of productivity.¹ As seen in Figure 3, this distribution of plant productivity is right-skewed, and the corresponding mode is around negative 25-30 percent. The average plant productivity is 6.6 percent less than the leading-edge level.




FIGURE 3. Distribution of Plant Productivity in the Steady State

The derived steady-state aggregate and other relevant values are listed in Table 2. Given the labor income share weight of $\frac{2}{3}$, output is 1.2649, created by the Cobb-Douglas production technology with inputs of effective capital, 29.9368, and labor, 0.26. Investment in new plants, 0.5077, net of scrapped capital, is net investment, 0.1762, so that consumption is 1.0887. Utility, which comes from consumption and leisure, is 2.2895. Without considering embodied technology, K^* is aggregate

¹This distribution is approximated by 71 abscissas, and the reason to choose this particular number is that singularity occurs with numbers larger than 71 in the process of deriving the structure form of this model.

capital, the sum of all physical units of capital, and is 31.0523, which is larger than effective capital. The exit threshold, denoted as \underline{u} , provides a guide for plants with lower productivity to exit the market and is -49.51 percent. From this we derive the exit and entry rates. The exit rate is the ratio of scrapped capital over aggregate capital, while the entry rate is the ratio of new capital entering into the market over aggregate capital. These values are 1.07 percent and 1.61 percent, respectively. Represented as κ , the marginal utility of leisure is treated as a parameter. Given the parameters in Table 1 and N of 0.26, the parameter κ is equal to 2.9790.

TABLE 2— Values in the Steady State without Government

\bar{K}^*	N	Y^*	I^*	C^*	U^*
29.9368	0.2600	1.2649	0.1762	1.0887	2.2895
K^*	I^{*1}	\underline{u}	Exit Rate	Entry Rate	κ
31.0523	0.5077	-49.51%	1.07%	1.61%	2.9790

The ranges for government expenditure and tax rates are to be decided before this quantitative experiment begins. Because the government fixes its expenditure before collecting tax revenue, we set government expenditure first. Since the steady-state output in the case of no government is 1.2649, we chose the set of potential government expenditure to be $\{ 10^{-9}, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4 \}$. In the subsequent grid search for the optimal combinations of capital-income, labor-income, and property tax rates, subsidies on capital income and property are also considered, again subject to the balanced budget constraint. It is of interest to see if there are benefits to any of these subsidies in the long run. Tax rates on capital income, labor income, and property arbitrarily range from $[-50\%, 50\%]$, $[0\%, 68\%]$, and $[-1\%, 1\%]$, respectively. The reason of property tax rates being narrowed between positive/negative 1 percent is because of the relative large tax base on plant value compared to firms'

capital income. The increment searched for all three taxes is 0.01 percent.

To be able to estimate excess burden later, a lump-sum tax is also considered, and consumption and utility are derived accordingly. Since the lump-sum tax is a non-distorting tax instrument that doesn't distort the decisions of investment and work hours, it is simply collected via consumption. Table 3 shows these values. Consumption, 1.0887, is directly reduced for different levels of government expenditure.

TABLE 3— Consumption and Utility in the Steady State with Lump-sum Tax

G^*	10^{-9}	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
C^*	1.0887	0.9887	0.8887	0.7887	0.6887
U^*	2.2895	2.1931	2.0865	1.9671	1.8315

Enter the first part of this experiment, where property tax rate is set to zero. Results for five different levels of government expenditure are illustrated respectively in the following five figures. Each figure contains eight small figures, where the x-axis is capital-income tax rate shown in percentage term. In the left top figure is the corresponding labor-income tax rate with which the capital-income tax rate is used to derive steady-state values. Among others, except the left figure in the second row, the y-axis represents the percentage difference of variables derived with distortionary taxes from those derived with lump-sum tax. As for the figure left, because the ratio of government expenditure to output is itself percentage, its y-axis is simply the difference between the ratio derived with distortionary taxes and that derived with lump-sum tax. Besides this, only consumption and utility are influenced by lump-sum tax, therefore most comparisons at this stage are made between steady states with distortionary taxes and without tax except the figures in the bottom row.

Figure 4 shows the results derived under different combinations of capital-income and labor-income tax rates given government expenditure at 10^{-9} . In the top left figure, when capital-income tax rate rises from -50 percent to a zero percent, labor-income tax rate slides from 25 percent to a near-zero percent. The x-axis stops at zero because we do not consider a subsidy on labor income. The relationship between these two rates is almost linear, implying that they are nearly perfectly substitutable when government expenditure is near zero. Next, output in the top right figure shapes concavely with both its starting and ending points staying close to zero (from below). The concavity comes from the opposite movement of effective capital and labor. In this case, when capital-income tax rate is negative, output (almost) always performs better than that derived without tax and reaches its peak about 1.95 percent more as capital-income tax rate is about -25 percent.

Because government expenditure is fixed and output is concave in the capital-income tax rate, the ratio of government expenditure to output in the left figure in the second row is convex. It starts at a near-zero point, falls to -1.5×10^{-9} percent when capital-income tax rate hits -25 percent, and then rises back to a near-zero percent. The curves of effective capital and (net) investment are identical, and their relationship with capital-income tax is negative. As the capital-income tax rate falls by one percent, effective capital and investment grow by the same magnitude. Normalized labor in the left figure in the third row drops from a near-zero percent to almost 19 percent as capital-income tax rate falls from a zero percent. This illustrates that, if capital-income subsidy rate is up by 2 percent, the corresponding 1-percent increase in the labor-income tax rate brings about a 0.75-percent reduction of labor force. The bottom two figures show that, with a negative capital-income tax rate, consumption is always worse compared to the situation when no government exists. On the contrary, utility is always higher because the increase in leisure makes up for




FIGURE 4. Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values Derived When $G^* = 10^{-9}$ and $\tau^p = 0$




FIGURE 4. continued

the loss in consumption. This result is of course dependent in part on the assumed utility function.

Observation 1: When government expenditure is close to zero, a capital-income subsidy brings higher steady-state utility to the economy.

Figures 5, 6, 7, and 8 show that the higher the government expenditure, the more convex the relationship between capital-income and labor-income taxes. This convexity implies that, when G^* is 0.2 or more, tax revenue lost by lowering the capital-income tax rate 1 percent needs to be filled in by using a larger increase in the labor-income tax rate than was necessary when the capital-income tax rate was originally lower. The output effect is positive only when government expenditure is infinitesimally small, and it turns out to be negative when government expenditure grows high enough. This change is due to the downward shifts in both effective capital and labor. Lowering the capital-income tax rate stimulates investment when G^* is 0.3 or less. Utility shifts downward with higher government expenditure although leisure does increase to offset part of the effect of reduced consumption. When G^* is 0.3 or more, a negative capital-income tax rate harms social welfare. Lastly, because output decreases with higher government expenditure, the ratio of government expenditure becomes positive.




FIGURE 5. Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values Derived When $G^* = 0.1$ and $\tau^p = 0$







FIGURE 5. continued




FIGURE 6. Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values Derived When $G^* = 0.2$ and $\tau^p = 0$







FIGURE 6. continued




FIGURE 7. Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values Derived When $G^* = 0.3$ and $\tau^p = 0$







FIGURE 7. continued




FIGURE 8. Capital-income Tax, Labor-income Tax, and Other Values Derived When $G^* = 0.4$ and $\tau^p = 0$







FIGURE 8. continued

The following table lists the optimal values in the steady state derived with different levels of government expenditure, zero property tax rate, and a specific combination of capital-income and labor-income tax rates. Note that while the above figures illustrate differences from baseline steady-state values, Table 4 presents steady-state values for the economy and not differences from a baseline.

TABLE 4— Values in the Steady State with Distortionary Taxes ($\tau_p = 0$)

G^*	$\tau_c(\%)$	$\tau_w(\%)$	Y^*	$\frac{G^*}{Y^*}(\%)$	\bar{K}^*	N	I^*	C^*	U^*
10^{-9}	-45.78	22.89	1.2719	7.86E-08	43.8822	0.2165	0.2582	1.0136	2.3475
0.1	-31.23	27.88	1.2230	8.18	37.9853	0.2194	0.2235	0.8995	2.2193
0.2	-15.83	33.66	1.1653	17.16	31.9467	0.2226	0.1880	0.7773	2.0641
0.3	0.99	40.64	1.0938	27.43	25.6325	0.2260	0.1508	0.6430	1.8643
0.4	20.82	49.86	0.9955	40.18	18.6566	0.2300	0.1098	0.4858	1.5719

Table 4 reveals several things about maintaining optimality with higher government expenditure. First, when government expenditure, G^* , is low (0.2 or less in our simulation), the optimal capital-income tax rate, τ_c , is negative. As G^* rises (here 0.3 or more), τ_c is positive. Second, both τ_c and the optimal labor-income tax rate, τ_w , increase with G^* . Third, the increase in τ_w results in more labor as G^* rises. Note that as G^* is fixed, rising labor-income tax rate still discourages labor. Fourth, among other variables, compared with steady-state values derived without government, effective capital, \bar{K}^* , and investment, I^* , are higher when G^* is 0.2 or less due to capital subsidies, and labor, N , derived with any level of government expenditure, is lower due to positive labor-income tax rate. Fifth, consumption in this table is lower than that derived with lump-sum tax in Table 3. Lastly and the most interestingly, utility derived when G^* is 0.1 or less is greater than that when

G^* is financed via lump-sum tax.

What causes this effect in this model? This effect seems to be a manifestation of intertemporal optimization resulting in a steady-state capital stock below the Golden Rule.² A set of taxes and subsidies can generate higher steady-state capital-labor ratios and greater steady-state utility, but it is not optimal for this to occur starting from an initial steady state without taxes. Because of discounting, the initial decline in consumption and utility necessary to support the increased investment required to accumulate the increased capital stock is too costly relative to the gain in steady-state utility.

Observation 2: Capital subsidies can improve steady-state social welfare when government expenditure is low enough.

The goal of this second part of the experiment is to provide a policy comparison for the government who considers the possibility of choosing one of either a capital-income tax or a property tax as the policy instrument in addition to a labor-income tax. Like Table 4, Table 5 summarizes the property and labor-income tax rates that maximize utility and the corresponding steady-state values derived with different government expenditure.

Compare Table 5 with Table 4. As G^* rises, τ_w rises as does property tax rate, τ_p , which is much smaller than τ_c . In all cases, the optimal way for the government to finance its expenditure is to subsidize capital income or property when G^* is low and raise taxes on labor income and on capital income or property as G^* rises until eventually the tax rate on capital income or property becomes positive. Behavior of other variables are similar as G^* rises. Utility is also higher when G^* is 0.1 or less than that derived with lump-sum tax. Subsidizing property lowers the purchase cost

²See Romer (2001) for the relation between steady state and golden rule.

paid by production firms at the beginning of the period and therefore raises these firms' incentive to purchase more plants to produce. Lastly, it is not obvious that choosing one of either a capital-income tax or a property tax creates more utility than choosing the other.

TABLE 5— Values in the Steady State with Distortionary Taxes ($\tau_c = 0$)

G^*	$\tau_p(\%)$	$\tau_w(\%)$	Y^*	$\frac{G^*}{Y^*}(\%)$	\bar{K}^*	N	I^*	C^*	U^*
10^{-9}	-0.41	22.89	1.2557	7.96E-08	42.9436	0.2147	0.2466	1.0092	2.3485
0.1	-0.31	27.74	1.2132	8.24	37.3607	0.2186	0.2158	0.8974	2.2195
0.2	-0.18	33.66	1.1605	17.23	31.6973	0.2220	0.1846	0.7759	2.0638
0.3	0.02	40.38	1.0946	27.41	25.5321	0.2267	0.1502	0.6444	1.8644
0.4	0.36	49.50	1.0013	39.95	18.7749	0.2312	0.1120	0.4894	1.5755

The third part of this experiment relaxes the limits on capital-income and property tax rates by allowing both of them to move simultaneously and expands the set of capital-income tax rate to $[-100\%, 100\%]$ to match that of the property tax rate as much as possible. The relevant results are illustrated in Figures 9, 10, and 11.

In Figure 9, the top figure features the change in the exit threshold as the property tax rate rises. As shown in Equation 2.14, capital-income tax affects consumers' willingness to invest, but its change does not affect the exit threshold of productivity. On the contrary, for a production firm, a higher property tax rate seemingly increases the purchase cost of a marginal plant at the beginning of the period, $(1 + \tau_p)q_t^0(\underline{v}_t)$, but it also reduces the plant' value, $q_t^0(\underline{v}_t)$, which in turn reduces the plant's resale value at the end of the period, $q_t^1(\underline{v}_t)$. According to Equation 2.13, when this marginal plant's resale value is less than η , the exit threshold must rise to satisfy Equation 2.14 again, which in turn raises exit and entry rates. In the top figure,

when the property tax rate is negative, the increase in the exit threshold is steep, but when the property tax is positive, the increase in the exit threshold is less steep. The bottom figure shows the same trend. From a tax rate of -1 percent to 0 percent, the exit rate rises by 0.54 percent and the entry rate rises by 0.65 percent. As the tax rate varies from 0 percent to 1 percent, the exit and entry rates rise by 0.32 and 0.39 percent, respectively. Note that the steps in the bottom figure come from the limited ability to use more abscissas caused by a singularity when the matrix decomposition is performed.³

³With more abscissas, spans, created by the Gauss-Legendre N-point quadrature formula between negative/positive one to simulate the distribution of the percentage difference in plant's productivity and the leading-edge productivity, become narrower. With narrower spans, the exit threshold crosses one span to another more easily so that exit and entry rates rise more quickly until steps are finally replaced by a curve. However, since the problem of singularity exists, simply connecting the middle point of each step to make it a curve may reduce confusions.




FIGURE 9. Exit Threshold, Exit Rate, and Entry Rate

The negative relationship between property and capital-income taxes is shown in Figure 10, where government expenditure is 10^{-9} . The capital-income tax rate falls from 72.67 percent to -100 percent when the property rate rises from -1 percent to 0.52 percent. Output, effective capital, labor, investment, and consumption illustrate the trend inherited from the exit threshold. Unlike the above aggregate variables rising over the entire set of property tax rate, utility mildly falls after property tax rate hits -0.21 percent, compared to its previous rising. The corresponding capital-income and labor-income tax rates that maximize utility are, respectively, -22.78 percent and 23.02 percent. The figure of the ratio of government expenditure to output looks empty because of the extremely low ratio. Another figure to compare with Figure 10 is Figure 11, where government expenditure is 0.4. In Figure 11, the shape of the ratio of government expenditure to output is symmetric to that of output. Capital-income tax rate, ratio of government expenditure to output, and labor move upwards, while others move downwards. The rising trend for utility extends until property tax rate reaches 0.77 percent, where the corresponding capital-income and labor-income tax rates are -24.38 percent and 49.74 percent, respectively.

Table 6 records the combinations of capital-income, labor-income, and property tax rates that creates the highest utility given a certain level of government expenditure, and the corresponding steady-state values. As before, the labor-income tax rate, τ_w , increases with government expenditure, G^* . While the property tax rate, τ_p , also shows the same pattern as that of τ_w , the capital-income tax rate, τ_c , decreases from -22.78 percent to -28.33 percent and then bounces back to -24.38 percent when G^* is 0.4. This result tells several things. First, when the government can avail itself of all three taxes, τ_c is negative over a reasonable range of G^* . Second, although τ_c falls as G^* rises and starts to rise after G^* reaches some threshold, (somewhere between 0.3 and 0.4 in this case), τ_c stays negative and overall is relatively stable,




FIGURE 10. Values in the Steady State When $G^* = 10^{-9}$







FIGURE 10. continued




FIGURE 11. Values in the Steady State When $G^* = 0.4$







FIGURE 11. continued

compared with τ_p and τ_w . Third, the optimal way for the government to finance higher G^* is through τ_p and τ_w rather than τ_c unless G^* is too high. In other words, when more marginal plants are forced to exit the market by higher property tax rate, capital subsidy is used instead to encourage the incentive to invest. Fourth, as the previous cases, utility is higher than that derived with lump-sum tax again when G^* is 0.1 or less.

TABLE 6— Values in the Steady State with Distortionary Taxes

G^*	$\tau_p(\%)$	$\tau_c(\%)$	$\tau_w(\%)$	$\frac{G^*}{Y^*}(\%)$	\bar{K}^*	N	C^*	U^*
10^{-9}	-0.21	-22.78	23.02	7.92E-08	43.4442	0.2151	1.0109	2.3492
0.10	-0.06	-25.33	27.93	8.20	37.8242	0.2188	0.8985	2.2203
0.20	0.14	-27.88	33.65	17.15	32.0056	0.2226	0.7778	2.0646
0.30	0.40	-28.33	40.59	27.30	25.8504	0.2266	0.6448	1.8652
0.40	0.77	-24.38	49.74	39.82	19.0033	0.2309	0.4892	1.5762

Observation 3: When capital-income, labor-income, and property taxes are available to the government, a positive capital-income tax rate might be the last resort for use when government spending is high.

In Chapter IV, we build up a dynamic system and discusses how the economy responses to two types of shocks over the transition from the old steady state to the new steady state.

CHAPTER IV

THE TRANSITIONAL ECONOMY

A. Building and Solving a Dynamic System

To build a dynamic system, the first step is to linearize equations with respect to all the transformed variables around their steady-state values and make each new variable in the dynamic system either as a percentage change between its period- t value and its steady-state value or as a difference between its period- t value and its steady-state value if the transformed variable is already a percentage. Next, these new variables are separated into four vectors, each containing control, state, co-state, or exogenous variables, respectively. Following procedures described in Campbell (1997), the linearized equations are also divided into four groups, and each group of equations is then merged into a large matrix equation. The vector containing exogenous variables accommodates different shock terms such as shocks to the leading-edge technology, tax rates, and the transformed government expenditure. Lastly, we use the method originally introduced in King, Plosser, and Rebelo (1987) to solve the dynamic system, which can be generalized as follows: ¹

$$aa * E_t(W_{t+1}) + bb * W_t + cc * E_t(Z_{t+1}) + dd * Z_t = 0 \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$Z_{t+1} = \phi * Z_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (4.2)$$

W_t include state variables and co-state variables at period t . Co-state variables

¹For further programming problem, please refer to Marimon and Scott (1999).

are decided by state and exogenous variables at the same period. In this model economy, co-state variables consist of the percentage deviations of the plant value of operating and developing plants and of the percentage deviation of the price of a contingent claim on one unit of consumption good as well. The state variables include the percentage deviations of the number of plants with different levels of productivity and of the percentage deviations of the previous investment on plants that haven't entered the market yet. Z_t includes various types of exogenous shocks. Control variables basically consists of the deviations of consumption, investment on newly-built plants, labor, effective capital, exit threshold, and the price for capital service. After control variables are determined by the co-state and state variables, the corresponding deviations of the original (before transformed into stationary) variables can be derived.

B. Quantitative Experiments

In this section, we perform four quantitative experiments which simulate the transitional paths of various variables caused by different types of shocks. The initial setting of the economy is presumably in its steady state before any shock hits the economy. In the first experiment, we suppose that initially the economy has very low government spending and the tax rates are almost zero. According to the previous chapter, when G^* is 10^{-9} , the optimal capital-income and labor-income tax rates in the steady state are -45.78 and 22.89 percent, given a zero property tax rate. Therefore, we would like to know how the economy will transit if the government starts subsidizing capital by taxing labor at the fore mentioned optimal rates without expectation. In the second experiment, we suppose that the economy is set to the optimal tax rates that maximize its social welfare before a positive shock to the leading-edge

technology hits the economy. The government maintains the pre-existing tax rates and letting government expenditure fluctuate with other variables after the shock. In other words, government expenditure is seen as a control variable, given tax rates as fixed. In order to differentiate the effects of capital-income and property taxes on the economy, a comparison is made between the transitional paths derived with the zero property tax rate and those derived with the zero capital-income tax rate.

The third experiment is different than the second experiment in one place. We suppose that the government lets one of the three taxes on capital income, labor income, or property fluctuate instead of the government expenditure. We would like to know which tax brings more utility over the transition. In the fourth experiment, we suppose that the government lowers its expenditure unexpectedly and attempts to satisfy the new level of government expenditure in the following periods by letting tax rates fluctuate subsequently. With fixed government expenditure and the zero property or capital-income tax rate, the dynamic system needs one more equation that describe the relation between the other two taxes. Suppose the government intends to guide tax rates to move from the original optimal combination to the new one that is optimal in the steady state with new level of government expenditure by setting a linear relationship which connects these two combinations of tax rates. This linear relationship will serve as the needed equation.

1. Impulse Response to a Permanent Change in Tax Rates

In Figure 12 are the impulse responses of various variables caused by a permanent change in capital-income and labor-income tax rates when the transformed government expenditure, G^* , is 10^{-9} before any shock occurs. Capital-income and labor-income tax rates are assumed to be near zero in the original steady state, so the economy has the least distortion on resource allocation. According to the previous

chapter, in the steady state with the government expenditure of 10^{-9} , the optimal combination of capital-income and labor-income tax rates is -45.78 and 22.89 percent, respectively, and therefore our first experiment is to simulate the transition after the government suddenly changes these two tax rates from near zero to the optimal rates.²

The transition in each small figure in Figure 12 is the deviation of the variable X from its original steady-state value. Its deviation at quarter t , x_t , is defined as $\frac{X_t - X_t^s}{X_t^s}$ if X is not a ratio, or $X_t - X_t^s$ otherwise. In this case, X_t^s is the original steady-state value derived with the near-zero capital-income and labor-income tax rates. When capital-income and labor-income tax rates are changed permanently at quarter 0, the exit threshold jumps up by 3.8 percent. The initial increase in the exit threshold is caused by the dramatic fall in the capital-income tax rate, which stimulates investment in new plants by subsidizing capital income, and its increase in turn causes the exit rate to rise by 1.2 percent in the following quarter and the entry rate to rise by 6 percent at quarter 5. Although the exit threshold is 1.6 percent higher than its original steady-state value at quarter 40, it will gradually fall back to its original steady-state value as time unfolds. Effective capital falls below its original steady-state value from quarters 1 to 4 because more marginal plants exit the market and steadily rises above its original steady-state value after more new plants enter the market at quarter 5. To accumulate more capital, employment first jumps up by 15 percent but falls afterwards, and consumption, in contrast to employment, drops by -28 percent at quarter 0 and gradually climbs back to about -10 percent at quarter

²Because of the linearization approximation, the approximation error caused by the change in capital-income and labor-income tax rates, $(-0.4578, 0.2289)$, might be large. This experiment simply provides an idea about why moving from near-zero capital-income and labor-income tax rates to the optimal ones might not be a good idea.




FIGURE 12. Impulse Response When (τ_c, τ_w) Changes From $(0, 0)$ to $(-0.4578, 0.2289)$




FIGURE 12. continued

40. In the long run, employment should be around -17 percent ($= \frac{0.2165-0.26}{0.26} \times 100$) and consumption should be around -7 percent ($= \frac{1.0136-1.0887}{1.0887} \times 100$).

The transitional path of output is the weighted sum of the deviations of effective capital and employment, assigned with $1 - \alpha$ and α as their respective weights, where α is $\frac{2}{3}$. Output initially moves up by 10 percent because of the increase in employment. Although output reaches its trough at quarter 4, it is still above its original steady-state value. The transitional path of investment is derived from the following simplified formula:

$$\frac{y_t Y^* - c_t C^* - g_t G^*}{Y^* - C^* - G^*} \quad (4.3)$$

Investment increases by a surprising 240 percent at quarter 0 and stays 120 percent higher than its original steady-state value at quarter 40. Investment will be around 47 percent ($= \frac{0.2582-0.1762}{0.1762} \times 100$) higher than its original steady-state value in the long run. After the government changes capital-income and labor-income tax rates, government expenditure stays below its original steady-state value until quarter 21. At quarter 0, government expenditure drops by -14 percent because of the capital-income subsidy, and it keeps dropping until quarter 4 because of the decrease in output. Lastly, the deviation of utility is decided by:

$$\frac{c_t - \kappa n_t N^*}{\ln C^* + \kappa (1 - N^*) + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} (t-1) \mu} \quad (4.4)$$

The level of the leading-edge technology one quarter before the shock occurs, z_{-1} , is supposed to appear in the denominator and is assumed to be zero here. Utility stays well below its original steady-state value over at least 10 years, which provides an explanation on why moving from the near-zero capital-income and labor-income tax rates to the optimal ones is not an attractive appeal if the loss of utility caused

by the purpose of capital accumulation over the transition is taken into account.

Observation 1: Although subsidizing capital by taxing labor brings higher utility in the steady state when the government expenditure is near zero, the fact that the loss of utility caused by the change in the capital-income and labor-income tax rates over the transition is too large makes this idea impractical.

2. Impulse Response to a Positive Technology Shock with Fixed Tax Rates

Figures 13 and 14 display the impulse responses of various variables caused by a technology shock that unexpectedly raises the level of the leading-edge technology by 1 percent, given the zero property tax rate. Capital-income and labor-income tax rates are set to be the rates that maximize the economy in the original steady state and are assumed to be fixed after the technology shock occurs so that the government expenditure fluctuate over the transition like the first experiment. There are four curves for the variable in each small figure, and each curve represents the deviation of the variable from the original steady-state value derived with different levels of G^* and the corresponding optimal tax rates. As G^* rises from 0.1 to 0.4, the corresponding curve types are solid, dashed and dotted, dashed, and dotted, respectively. Note that variables which have the same steady-state values no matter in the original or in the transformed economy are exit threshold, exit rate, entry rate, and employment.

In Figure 13, the top two figures and the left figure in the second row illustrate the transitional paths of the exit threshold, exit rate, and entry rate. The steady-state values of these three variables are unrelated with government expenditure because of the zero property tax rate, and they are -49.51 percent, 1.07 percent, and 1.61 percent, respectively. After the shock hits the economy at quarter 0, the exit threshold moves up by 1.095 percent, so marginal plants with the productivity




FIGURE 13. Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_p = 0$ ($G^* = 0.1$ –Solid, 0.2–Dashed & Dotted, 0.3–Dashed, 0.4–Dotted)




FIGURE 13. continued




FIGURE 14. Rest of the Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_p = 0$ ($G^* = 0.1$ –Solid, 0.2–Dashed & Dotted, 0.3–Dashed, 0.4–Dotted)

difference between -48.415 percent and -49.51 percent are forced to exit. Afterwards, the deviation of the exit threshold smoothly falls and reaches 1.04 percent at quarter 40. In the long run, because the shock size is 1 percent, the exit threshold should be around 1 percent higher than the original exit threshold. There are two spikes for the existing plants exiting the market. The first one occurs at quarter 1, and the exit rate moves up by 0.35 percent. The second one occurs at quarter 6 after new plants, built at quarter 0 and embodied with higher-than-usual level of technology, enter at quarter 5, and the exit rate moves up again by 0.10 percent. The amplitude of the first rise is 32.71 ($= 0.35/1.07$) percent of the steady-state exit rate. The entry rate jumps up by 0.413 percent at quarter 5 and then falls only to rise again at quarter 10.

The deviations of effective capital, consumption, and employment are in the

second and third rows of Figure 13, and it seems that government expenditure has rather negligible effect on the transitions of the first two variables. Effective capital is fixed at quarter 0 but continues to fall in the following 4 quarters because more marginal plants exit the market than usual. After hitting its trough at -0.6 percent, effective capital starts to rise at quarter 5 and becomes positive at quarter 7. At quarter 40, effective capital is 0.95 percent higher than its original steady-state value. Consumption and employment react in opposite direction right after the shock happens. Consumption is smoothed by first dropping by -0.2 percent and then steadily increasing 0.4 percent through quarter 40. Employment with higher government expenditure tends to respond a bit less to the shock than that with lower government expenditure, but their transitional paths stay pretty close. Generally speaking, employment jumps up by 0.6 percent at quarter 0 because of the fixed capital and the incentive to invest more on new plants built at that same quarter, and then after quarter 0, employment keeps falling until it rises again at quarter 5 and finally reaches 0.3 percent at quarter 40.

At quarter 0, output rises by 0.4 percent due to the sudden increase in employment, and then, just like effective capital and employment, it falls after quarter 0 but rises at quarter 5. Although employment starts to fall after quarter 16, output keeps rising and stops at 0.5 percent higher than the original steady-state value at quarter 40. Investment on building new plants rises by 2.7 percent at quarter 0 but turns negative after quarter 2. It bounces up after quarter 4 and stays 1.7 percent higher than the original steady-state value at quarter 40. In Figure 14 are the transitions of the government expenditure and utility. The transitional path of the government expenditure is identical to output's because of the zero property tax rate and the fixity of the capital-income and labor-income tax rates over the transition. The transition of utility with higher G^* seems to be more volatile. The transitional

paths of utility derived with the zero property tax rate and those derived with the zero capital-income tax rate will be compared and discussed more in detail in the later part.

Next, the result shown in Figures 15 and 16 is the impulse responses caused by 1-percent technology shock, given a zero capital-income tax rate. How are these transitional paths different from those in the previous case? In the top left part of Figure 15 is the transitional path of the exit threshold. Economies with different levels of G^* in the original steady state obviously differ in responding to the technology shock compared with those in the previous case of the zero property tax rate. As the technology shock occurs, the exit threshold of the economy with G^* being 0.1 moves up by 1.15 percent, and its following fall through quarter 40 is 0.08 percent while the corresponding numbers for the economy with G^* being 0.4 are 1.02 percent and 0.015 percent, respectively. By comparing these numbers with the original steady-state values of the optimal property tax rates and exit thresholds (listed in the second row of Table 7), it indicates that economies with low G^* , low optimal property tax rate, and thus low exit threshold, tends to respond more than those with higher G^* after the shock happens.

TABLE 7— Exit Threshold, Exit Rate, and Entry Rate

Original G^*	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
SS Exit Threshold (%)	-57.51	-53.65	-49.17	-43.40
SS Exit Rate (%)	0.92	0.99	1.07	1.16
$\Delta ExitRate_1$ (%)	0.27	0.30	0.39	0.61
Entry Rate (%)	1.43	1.52	1.61	1.72
$\Delta EntryRate_5$ (%)	0.31	0.35	0.47	0.76

However, relatively large initial rise in the exit threshold does not necessarily




FIGURE 15. Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_c = 0$ ($G^* = 0.1$ —Solid, 0.2—Dashed & Dotted, 0.3—Dashed, 0.4—Dotted)




FIGURE 16. Rest of the Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $\tau_c = 0$ ($G^* = 0.1$ —Solid, 0.2—Dashed & Dotted, 0.3—Dashed, 0.4—Dotted)

bring in a larger change in exit (or entry) rate here. As shown in Table 7, it is the economy with G^* being 0.4 that has the highest exit rate, 0.61 percent, at quarter 1, while that with G^* being 0.1 has the lowest exit rate, 0.27 percent. The reason for this is because when G^* is high, the level of the initial capital stock is lower and because the density of the steady-state distribution of productivity difference in Figure 3 rises around these relevant exit thresholds.

Next, effective capital derived with higher G^* drops more than that derived with lower G^* because economies with higher G^* have higher exit rate at quarter 1. This situation lasts until quarter 5 as new plants embodied with higher-than-usual technology finally enter the market. After quarter 5, it seems that economies with higher G^* gradually accumulate effective capital in a quicker pace than those with lower G^* . In consumption, faced with more volatile transition of effective capital, economies with higher G^* adjust it by cutting more consumption initially and enjoying more rapid consumption growth later. Employment in economies with higher G^* initially rises more but falls more afterwards because of the higher exit rate of plants and the higher labor-income tax rate. As a whole, employment starts to rise after quarter 4, and in the long run, the deviation of the employment in economies with higher G^* is less than that in economies with lower G^* .

The deviation of output is determined by those of effective capital and employment. Economies with higher G^* tend to have larger deviation in investment. The transitional paths of government expenditure derived with different levels of G^* respond differently compared to those in the case of the zero property tax rate. Because the property tax rate is not zero, which implies that the change in the exit threshold or plant value affects the government expenditure, this transitional path is not identical to output's as in the case of the zero property tax rate. The deviation of government expenditure derived with lower G^* in the original steady state tends to

be positive because when G^* is lower in the original steady state, the optimal property tax rate is negative. When the number of plants falls, the subsidy on property is not as much as before, so without property tax rate changed, government expenditure increases when other variables do not perform as well. Finally, the transition of utility is more volatile when G^* is higher, because its consumption and employment usually respond more compared with those derived with lower G^* .

Observation 2: In contrast to the similarity among the transitional paths of a variable derived with different G^* in the case of the zero property tax rate, the transition of a variable derived with a higher G^* in the case of the zero capital-income tax rate seems to respond more than that derived with a lower G^* when faced with a positive technology shock.

The deviations of utility derived from the zero property tax rate or zero capital-income tax rate are compared in Figure 17. In each small figure, the solid curve is derived when the property tax rate is zero, and the dashed one is derived when the capital-income tax rate is zero. In the top left figure, when the original G^* is 0.1, the dashed curve is above the solid one before quarter 20 and is below afterwards. In the bottom left figure, when G^* is 0.3, the dashed curve matches the solid one. This is because in the case of zero capital-income tax rate, the original optimal property tax rate when G^* is 0.3 is 0.02 percent, which is very close to 0 percent, and because of this, the steady-state exit threshold is close, and the exit and entry rates are the same as those when the government uses optimal capital-income tax rate. In the bottom right figure, the dashed curve is not always above the solid one before quarter 15 but becomes above to the other curve afterwards.

In the top two figures, with G^* is smaller than 0.3, the steady-state exit threshold, exit rate, and entry rate are smaller than those when G^* is 0.3. And in the







FIGURE 17. Impulse Response: $\tau_p = 0$ (Solid) vs. $\tau_c = 0$ (Dashed)

bottom right figure, these three variables are all higher than those when G^* is 0.3. Yet when G^* is 0.4, the relation between the two curves change in that the dashed one seems to bring more utility to the economy during the later part of the transition, while with G^* being less or equal to 0.3, the utility brought by the technology might not be as much as the solid line.

Observation 3: When G^* is low and a positive technology shock occurs, social welfare in the economy with the zero capital-income tax rate may perform better in the early part of the transition and worse in the later part of the transition than that in the economy with the zero property tax rate. As G^* increases, the situation becomes the opposite.

3. Impulse Response to a Positive Technology Shock with One Changing Tax Rate

Different from the second experiment, this experiment simulates the transition caused by 1-percent technology shock when one tax rate, instead of G^* , is allowed to change after the shock. As before, the tax rates in the original steady state are optimal. Figures 18 and 19 show the result derived when G^* is 0.01 and the property tax rate is zero. The original optimal capital-income and labor-income tax rates are -31.23 and 27.88 percent. The solid, dashed and dotted, and dotted curves in each small figure are derived when the capital-income tax rate, labor-income tax rate, and property tax rate is allowed to fluctuate, respectively. Except the top left figure, the others in Figure 19 illustrate the transitions of capital-income, labor-income, and property tax rate when one of them is allowed to move after the shock.

In Figure 18, at quarter 0, the exit threshold increases by 1.1 percent derived with the changing capital-income tax rate and 1.12 percent derived with the changing labor-income or property tax rate. The transitions of the tax rates in the next figure




FIGURE 18. Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $G^* = 0.1$ (τ_c —Solid, τ_w —Dashed & Dotted, τ_p —Dashed)




FIGURE 18. continued




FIGURE 19. Rest of the Impulse Response When $\varepsilon_z = 0.01$, $G^* = 0.1$ (τ_c —Solid, τ_w —Dashed & Dotted, τ_p —Dashed)

show that all the three tax rates fall at quarter 0 because of the fixed G^* and the increase in employment. Remember in the second experiment, when the initial G^* is 0.1 and the capital-income tax rate is zero, the exit threshold rises by 1.15 percent, which is higher than 1.12 percent here. This is because in this experiment, a lower property tax rate at quarter 0 raises the plant value so that the exit threshold is slightly less than 1.15 percent. Also in the second experiment, when the initial G^* is 0.1 and the property tax rate is zero, the exit threshold moves up by 1.095 percent, which is lower than 1.1 percent here. The reason for the initial increase in the exit threshold being a bit higher here is that a lower capital-income tax rate at quarter 0 encourages investment in new plants so that the exit threshold is slightly more than 1.095 percent. After quarter 0, because G^* is assumed to be fixed, and when a positive technology shock happens, marginal plants exit the market, to collect enough tax revenue to satisfy the fixed G^* requires higher tax rate, which in turn makes the exit threshold rises further more until quarter 4. The difference in the deviations of the exit threshold derived with a different changing tax rate does not make much difference in the exit and entry rates. When labor-income tax rate fluctuate, the deviation of consumption falls below the other two curves, and the employment responds more strongly as well. In Figure 19, a changing labor-income tax rate brings more utility than a changing capital-income or property tax rate, and the utility mainly comes from the increase in leisure when employment falls in the first several quarters. Except the exit threshold, the deviations of various variables derived when either capital-income or property tax rate fluctuates are almost the same as those in Figure 13.

4. Impulse Response to a Negative Government Expenditure Shock

In this experiment, we simulate the impulse responses caused by 1 percent sudden decrease in G^* at quarter 0 when tax rates, (τ_c, τ_w) or (τ_p, τ_w) , fluctuate after the shock. A relation between the two tax rates must be built in order to derive their transitions, and this relationship is assumed to connect two combinations of the two rates that are each optimal for the old and new levels of government expenditure. To simplify the calculation, this relation is assumed to be linear. Figures 20 and 21 show the result derived when the original G^* is 0.1 and 0.2, given the zero property tax rate. The solid curve is derived with G^* being 0.1, and the dotted curve is derived with G^* being 0.2. Figures 22 and 23 display the result derived when the original G^* is 0.1 and 0.2, given the zero capital-income tax rate.

In Figure 20, the top two figures are the transitional paths of capital-income and labor-income tax rates. When G^* falls by 1 percent at quarter 0, the fall in both of the tax rates increases as G^* becomes higher. When G^* is 0.2, capital-income and labor-income tax rates rise in the first 5 quarters, fall a bit at quarter 5, and stay pretty constant afterwards. The exit threshold derived with a higher G^* rises more than that derived with a lower G^* because of the larger fall in capital-income and labor-income tax rates when G^* is higher. At quarter 0, consumption rises by 0.04 percent when G^* 0.1 and by 0.11 percent when G^* is 0.2 and keeps rising afterwards. Employment stays well above zero over the transition. When G^* falls by 1 percent, the economy with higher G^* seems to be affected more. Both consumption and employment derived with a higher G^* are above those derived with a lower G^* . Also, the decrease in G^* seems to benefit the economy with a higher G^* more than that with a lower G^* .




FIGURE 20. Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_p = 0$




FIGURE 20. continued




FIGURE 21. Rest of the Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_p = 0$

In Figure 22, property and labor-income tax rates fall as G^* decreases by 1 percent. Notice that the exit threshold moves downward over the transition because of the fall in the property tax rate. Therefore, when G^* is higher, the exit threshold moves more downward, and the corresponding exit rate is also lower. Compared with the economy with the zero property tax rate, the economy with the zero capital-income tax rate has lower exit threshold over the transition, and except this, its deviations of effective capital, consumption, employment, output, and investment are all higher. However, because both consumption and employment rise, its deviation of utility is almost the same as that derived with the zero property tax rate.

Observation 4: Consumption and employment are more stimulated by a negative shock to government expenditure when the capital-income tax rate is zero.

Observation 5: The unexpected decrease of government expenditure brings more utility to the economy with a higher G^* .




FIGURE 22. Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_c = 0$




FIGURE 23. Rest of the Impulse Response When G^* Falls by 1 % and $\tau_c = 0$






FIGURE 23. continued

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Based on a vintage-capital model with exit and entry of plants developed by Campbell (1998), this paper enlarges the model by combining a government sector into it and examines the effects of the three tax instruments, including capital-income, labor-income, and property taxes, on the steady-state economy as well as the transitional economy. In Chapter III, given various combinations of transformed government expenditure and tax rates, a steady-state transformed economy where, except idiosyncratic shocks, there is no other types of shocks at all, is solved. A comparison is further made among different sets of optimal steady-state values, and the conclusions are reached to provide some guides of optimal taxation for the government. They are summarized as follows:

In the case of zero property tax rate, when government expenditure is close to zero, raising the capital-income subsidy may be beneficial to the economy. As a matter of fact, the optimal capital-income tax rate may be negative, zero, or positive, depending on the magnitude of government expenditure.

After a comparison between the optimal steady-state values derived with zero property tax rate and those derived with zero capital-income tax rate, it is found that to choose between taxing capital income or taxing property also depends on the level of government expenditure.

When it is feasible for the government to tax on capital income, labor income, and property, the optimal capital-income tax rate is always negative.

Following that, a dynamic system is built and solved in Chapter IV. Four quantitative experiments are performed under different assumptions. The relevant results are summarized as follows:

Although subsidizing capital by taxing labor brings higher utility in the steady state when the government expenditure is near zero, the fact that the loss of utility caused by the change in the capital-income and labor-income tax rates over the transition is too large makes this idea impractical.

In contrast to the similarity among the transitional paths of a variable derived with different G^* in the case of the zero property tax rate, the transition of a variable derived with a higher G^* in the case of the zero capital-income tax rate seems to respond more than that derived with a lower G^* when faced with a positive technology shock.

When G^* is low and a positive technology shock occurs, social welfare in the economy with the zero capital-income tax rate may perform better in the early part of the transition and worse in the later part of the transition than that in the economy with the zero property tax rate. As G^* increases, the situation becomes the opposite.

Consumption and employment are more stimulated by a negative shock to government expenditure when the capital-income tax rate is zero.

The unexpected decrease of government expenditure brings more utility to the economy with a higher G^* .

REFERENCES

- Aiyagari, S. Rao.** “Optimal Capital Income Taxation with Incomplete Markets, Borrowing Constraints, and Constant Discounting.” *Journal of Political Economy*, December 1995, *103* (6), pp. 1158–75.
- Atkeson, Andrew; Chari, V. V. and Kehoe, Patrick J.** “Taxing Capital Income: A Bad Idea.” *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review*, 1999, *23* (3), pp. 3–17.
- Campbell, Jeffrey R.** “Entry, Exit, Embodied Technology, and Business Cycles: Computational Appendix.” Unpublished working paper, University of Rochester and NBER, March 1997.
- . “Entry, Exit, Embodied Technology, and Business Cycles.” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, April 1998, *1* (2), pp. 371–408.
- Chamley, Christophe.** “Optimal Taxation of Capital Income in General Equilibrium with Infinite Lives.” *Econometrica*, May 1986, *54* (3), pp. 607–22.
- Cooley, Thomas F. and Quadrini, Vincenzo.** “Financial Markets and Firm Dynamics.” *American Economic Review*, December 2001, *91* (5), pp. 1286–1310.
- Cooley, Thomas F.; Greenwood, Jeremy and Yorukoglu, Mehmet.** “The Replacement Problem.” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, December 1997, *40* (3), pp. 457–99.
- Cooper, Russell; Haltiwanger, John and Power, Laura.** “Machine Replacement and the Business Cycle: Lumps and Bumps.” *American Economic Review*, September 1999, *89* (4), pp. 921–46.

- Cummins, Jason G. and Violante, Giovanni L.** “Investment-Specific Technical Change in the United States (1947-2000): Measurement and Macroeconomic Consequences.” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, April 2002, 5 (2), pp. 243–84.
- DeLong, Bradford and Summers, Lawrence H.** “Equipment Investment and Economic Growth.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 1991, 106 (2), pp. 445–502.
- Gilchrist, Simon and Williams, John C.** “Putty-Clay and Investment: A Business Cycle Analysis.” *Journal of Political Economy*, October 2000, 108 (5), pp. 928–60.
- Greenwood, Jeremy; Hercowitz, Zvi and Krusell, Per.** “Long-Run Implications of Investment-Specific Technological Change.” *American Economic Review*, June 1997, 87 (3), pp. 342–62.
- Hopenhayn, Hugo A.** “Entry, Exit, and Firm Dynamics in Long Run Equilibrium.” *Econometrica*, September 1992, 60 (5), pp. 1127–50.
- Jones, Charles I.** “Economic Growth and the Relative Price of Capital.” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, December 1994, 34 (3), pp. 359–82.
- King, Robert G.; Plosser, Charles I. and Rebelo, Sergio T.** “Production Growth and Business Cycles: Technical Appendix.” Unpublished working paper, University of Rochester, May 1987.
- Laitner, John.** “Quantitative Evaluations of Efficient Tax Policies for Lucas’ Supply Side Models.” *Oxford Economic Papers*, July 1995, 47 (3), pp. 471–92.
- Lucas, Jr. Robert E.** “Supply-Side Economics: An Analytical Review.” *Oxford Economic Papers*, April 1990, 42 (2), pp. 293–316.

- Marimon, Ramon and Scott, Andrew, eds.** *Computational methods for the study of dynamic economies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Romer, David.** *Advanced macroeconomics*. Boston, Massachusetts: McGraw-Hill, 2001.
- Sakellaris, Plutarchos and Wilson, Daniel J.** “Quantifying Embodied Technological Change.” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, January 2004, 7 (1), pp. 1–26.
- Solow, Robert M.** “Investment and Technical Progress,” in Kenneth J. Arrow, Samuel Karlin, and Patrick Suppes, eds., *Mathematical Methods in the Social Sciences, 1959*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1960, pp. 89–104.
- Thomas, Julia K.** “Is Lumpy Investment Relevant for the Business Cycle?” *Journal of Political Economy*, June 2002, 110 (3), pp. 508–34.
- Yorukoglu, Mehmet.** “The Information Technology Productivity Paradox.” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, April 1998, 1 (2), pp. 551–92.

VITA

Shao-jung Chang received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Diplomacy from the National Cheng Chi University at Taipei, Taiwan, in 1997. She entered the Economics program at Texas A&M University in September 1998, and she received her Doctor of Philosophy degree in December 2005. Her research interests include monetary and fiscal policy, investment, and firm dynamics. Ms. Chang may be reached at the Department of Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4228. Her email address is shao-jung-chang@neo.tamu.edu.